

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 94 16:29:28 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #606
To: Info-Hams

Today's Topics:

"World Broadcast News" (April '94)
440 in So. Cal. (2 msgs)
CORRECTION - Mt. Equinox special event station
Ham Radio few problem
LOOKING FOR CLUB STATIONS
NEEDED: FCC Compliant FM Xmitter
RVRC Hamfest (Central NJ, 6/18)
TRANSVERTERS

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 1 Jun 1994 18:50:28 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!bt!nemesis.muppet.bt.co.uk!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "World Broadcast News" (April '94)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm looking for the text of an article that appeared in the April edition of the magazine "World Broadcast News".

The article referred to a radio station which wished to broadcast in Austria.

Apparently the Austrian authorities had claimed that the station would need a licence to broadcast and they were not going to issue one.

The station then took their case to the European court and a ruling was made in

their favour based on the finding that a licence was not required.

I realise that there may be some inaccuracies in the above synopsis (for example I didn't know that Austria was under the jurisdiction of the European courts yet) but if anyone knows of the article could they supply me with the text or let me know where I could get a copy of the April edition.

Thanks in advance,

Eamonn.

Date: 1 Jun 94 20:00:58 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

nuts.

Southern California isn't the whole US. Most of the US doesn't have the packing density that's present out there - even in the other big metro areas.

We've got something like 11 440 MHz systems in the area that are reachable with modest equipment. and i can scan 'em all day and see only light use (fewer "kerchunks" because the PL stops noise from doing that...)

and 2m isn't CB here either. we've got a few drunks that are being worked on but we're smart enough to work the issue w/o having to spend big bucks on suits...(all are pre-2/14 tech or higher (several extras...)) although it appears on the surface there's a lot of posturing going on to get the "legal" solution applied in one of the radio clubs - i think all that will do is clean out the club treasury even if they "win"). heck the "closed" VHF repeater can have days when it's busy all day long and the "open" repeaters are devoid of contacts.

saying that "2m is CB today" is repeated assertion (big lie technique). just like the guys that like to repeat that "you just can't build anything anymore" or that "10m is dead until the next sunspot peak, don't even listen to the band or call CQ because you won't hear anything". It can be a self-fulfilling prophecy if the folks expecting lid operation on 2m also act like lids when they are on 2 - thereby reinforcing a bad example.

Bly & Co. are going about it the wrong way - but then he's a Wanna-Be-Establishment-Pretend-Radical-I-Have-No-Life sort of guy. He should be bright enough to know the only way you can get this stuff to change w/o just lining the participants up against the wall is to infiltrate, take

control and then show your true colors. He should have figured this out by himself but he likes to grandstand and you can't monkey in the works when you call attention to yourself like that. Grandstanding tends to cause "immune" reactions when you really want to get inside and control the "organism" like a good little virus.

Of course, it's too late for roger to take this approach - sounds like he's well known to the power structure and they've id'ed him as a problem to be watched. he can only cause trouble and inconvience with minimal impact on the power structure.

73, bill wb9ivr

Date: 1 Jun 94 22:27:25 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Oh well, I sat on the sidelines long enough on this one, so here's my .02 worth:

First of all, there are several open 440 systems in So. Cal. Of course, if you only consider LA and Orange counties, there are fewer, but they are there. Lot's more in San Diego and Imperial counties.

Some of the closed 440 repeaters I am familiar with in the LA/OC area are special use systems, i.e.: earthquake nets/telemetry, RACES, . . . Yes, most are closed, and seem rather quiet. Several repeater trustees I have talked to are more than willing to admit new members to their clubs for repeater access, and naturally they want the user to pay dues. The dues pay the phone bill, maintenance, and upgrades. Most are also tolerant of an occasional user who is not a repeater club member. I have had one trustee specifically invite me to participate in QSO's now and then even if I don't join. Some systems don't want money, they want participation, i.e.: RACES/ARES. One way or another, someone needs to pay the bills.

On the other hand, as one who travels a bit, I am happy to find so many open machines across the country. When I go into an area, I usually look up a repeater, preferably with open 911 access, and plug the frequency into my HT. I can find someone to talk to, I've participated in some interesting nets, and been able to help in some bad situations. I had a shredded motorcyclist last week who needed help, an open machine and someone with access codes got the help there. I am grateful to all who maintain an open machine and graciously allow me the use of there systems, but I have no right to demand it of them. I do have a right to use the frequency, but if the system owner chooses to use an unpublished pl or other method to

restrict access to the machine, I need to respect that. It is called courtesy.

All areas seem to have their good and their bad operators, and I have seen no correlation between class of license and good/bad operation. People new to amateur radio, or new to a particular region with "local customs" make more mistakes than the old timers. That is cured with time and tolerance. Mistakes by themselves don't make an operator a lid, bad manners do.

(I deliver quite a lot for .02, don't I?) :-)

Wm. A. Kirsanoff Internet: WAKIRSAN@ananov.remnet.ab.com
Rockwell International Ham: KD6MCI
(714) 762-2872
Alternate Internet: william.a.kirsanoff@ccmail.anatcp.rockwell.com

Who are you? * I am number 2. * Who is number 1? * You are number 6.

Date: 1 Jun 1994 20:30:17 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!xap!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CORRECTION - Mt. Equinox special event station
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Here is a correction to my previous posting. (I had the times wrong.)

The Wellesley (MA) ARS will operate W1TKZ on HF/VHF/UHF from Mt. Equinox in southern Vermont in the weekend of June 11/12. This is a great chance to add Vermont to your WAS list, or add FN33 to your VUCC grid totals. Because of the date change for this year's ARRL June VHF QSO Party, we will *not* be participating in that event, so if you were counting on the contest to find us for FN33 or Vt, look for us instead on the traditional second weekend in June.

Our Mt. Equinox station will be operated in conjunction with the annual vintage car race up the Mount Equinox auto road. We plan be on the air from 1900Z to 0200Z June 11/12 and 1300Z to 2000Z June 12. VHF/UHF operation will be SSB/CW on 50.160 144.210 432.110 and FM on 146.55 and 446.00. HF operation will be in the lower portions of the General phone and CW subbands on 80-12m and the Novice phone and CW subbands. QSL to the Wellesley ARS, 200H Linden St., Wellesley, MA 02181-7913.

We're hoping for some good VHF/UHF openings and good HF band conditions!

Scott W01G, Vice President, Wellesley Amateur Radio Society

Scott Sminkey email: sasminkey@eng.xyplex.com
Software Sustaining Engineering voice: 508 952-4792
Xyplex, Inc. fax: 508 952-4887
295 Foster St. (Opinions, comments, etc. are mine,
Littleton, MA 01460 not Xyplex's...)

Date: Tue, 31 May 1994 16:36:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham Radio few problem
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

>
>> I do not see why people would go out and buy equipment for a place
>> where they aren't welcome. This is, perhaps, mostly the fault of the
>> ham radio stores; they don't tell people that the dual-band x/440
>> radios are really only useful if you are invited on one of the closed
>> systems on 440. Luckily, manufacturers are now selling 2m/220 and
>> 2m/220/1200 radios which should be much more popular.

>
>You know, this is a good point which most people don't even think
>of. Closed repeaters on 440mhz were the standard in most areas,
>because 2m was heavily used and the coordinating bodies wanted to
>insure that the open repeaters were coordinated on frequencies which
>many people used.

>
>Of course, over time, demographics change. With the demand for dual-
>band radios over the past two years, people are able to inexpensively
>get on 440mhz. Then they cry FOUL! when they find out that most 440mhz
>repeaters are closed. Well, that's tough. Five to ten years ago when
>you wanted to set up a closed repeater you were told you had to do it
>on 440mhz. So, you make the investment and do it. Now, just because of
>the influx of many VHF operators and low-cost equipment you're going to
>change the rules, after trustees have spent thousands of dollars, simply
>because some people are mad that they can't yack on 440mhz without
>joining a repeater group?

>
>As the trustee of a coordinated closed repeater, if anyone told me that I had

>a choice to either "open" my machine or loose coordination, I would opt for
>choice number three: protect my legal, FCC-recognized closed repeater
>coordination via litigation.

I agree totally with Michael. Nuff Said.

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 20:15:45 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!usenet.ucs.indiana.edu!master.cs.rose-hulman.edu!e106-2.rose-
hulman.edu!Dave@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: LOOKING FOR CLUB STATIONS
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>Subject: LOOKING FOR CLUB STATIONS
>Date: Mon, 30 May 1994 16:40:17 GMT

-

>| -----|
>| Jose' Miguel M.B.Fonte | Aveiro University - PORTUGAL - EUROPE |
>| Box 108 - 4801 Guimaraes - PT. | Electronics and Telecommunications Dept. |
>| E-mail : etjfonte@ci.ua.pt |---|-----|
PACKET : CT1ENQ@CT1EDY.CTAV.PRT.EU	Ham:CT1ENQ - Univer.Club: CT6ARU
>Vai-se de fracasso em fracasso ate' ao exito final.

> Charles F. Keitering

Jose

Hello from ROSE-HULMAN Institute of Technology, Terre Haute Indiana.
Our Club station is W9NAA. Its been around awhile

We operate all lo bands + 2m + 70cm + 440 +++. AM, do any
wet nosed xCBrs know what that is? FM, SSB, FSK, RTTY, SLOW/fast SCAN,
packet.

We are an engineering college, so not much ham activity during
the summer. Contact us anytime though to set up schedules. The gang
would love th have sat schedules this fall.

Email David.Gahimer@Rose_Hulman.edu
73/s DE K9ZCE

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 18:23:28 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.service.uci.edu!ttinews!avatar!sorgatz@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: NEEDED: FCC Compliant FM Xmitter
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2si9k8\$2s8@agate.berkeley.edu> tah@uclink.berkeley.edu (Timothy Andrew Hooper) writes:

>I am trying to get a community station off of the ground in rural Vermont,
>and finding the FCC regulations to be a serious stumbling block. Rather
>than pay several thousand for a new transmitter, or pay several thousand
>to get a homebrew transmimtter cleared by the FCC, I'd like to find someone
>(or some station) with an old low power (50 watts or so) transmitter that
>they would be willing to sell or give away (tax-deductible).

>
>If you have such an item, or have any good ideas about where I could find
>such a thing, please send me mail at:

>
>tah@uclink.berkeley.edu
>
>Thanks,
>Andy
>

Yeah...me too! Only I'm not as picky...I'll take any old AM broadcast transmitter,
even one of those crummy 500-1000 watt, all tube, plate-modulated jobbers! ;-)

-Avatar-> (aka: Erik K. Sorgatz) KB6LUY +-----+
TTI(es@soldev.tti.com)or: sorgatz@avatar.tti.com *Government produces NOTHING!*
3100 Ocean Park Blvd. Santa Monica, CA 90405 +-----+
(OPINIONS EXPRESSED DO NOT REFLECT THE VIEWS OF CITICORP OR ITS MANAGEMENT!)

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 22:16:34 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!
osceola.cs.ucf.edu!fang!ulysses!ulysses.att.com!wmb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: RVRC Hamfest (Central NJ, 6/18)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

* Raritan Valley Radio Club Hamfest *

* Back at Dunellen this year! *

* DATE/TIME: June 18, 1994 / 8 AM - 2 PM *
* PLACE: Columbia Park, Dunellen, NJ *
* SPONSOR: Raritan Valley Radio Club *
* FEATURES: * Large outdoor flea-market area * Prizes *
* * ARRL-approved * DXCC checking * AMSAT reps *
* * Commercial vendors * W2 QSL Bureau *
* * Refreshments * Free parking *
* TALK-IN: WA2UDT/R 146.625; 146.52 simplex *
* K2OIY/R 442.250 (PL 141.3) *
* KQ2H/R 53.73 (PL 110.9) & 224.8 (PL 110.9) *
* TAILGATING: Pre-registration recommended! Make checks *
* payable to "RVRC" and mail to Guy - KE2CG, *
* 240 Grant Ave., Piscataway NJ 08854 *
* VE EXAMS: No testing at Hamfest. *
* Next test date 8/27 in Raritan, NJ. *
* Contact Roger, N2LAQ, at 908 231-0009 *
* OTHER INFO: (please call before 8:30 PM) *
* John, WA2F (908 722-9045) *
* Bob, WB2CVL (908 846-2056) *
* *

For info via email, contact me.

Bill Brelsford, K2DI
AT&T, Basking Ridge
wmb@joplin.att.com

Date: 1 Jun 94 22:06:33 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: TRANSVERTERS
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Another source of 6-m transverter KITS is Down East Microwave. Bill had a preproduction unit at Central States last July, so I suppose that he must be shipping them by now..... Ok Ok, Bill wasn't there, but the transverter was. See the mags for the address (QST, AMSAT Journal, etc).

73 de w3otc@amsat.org

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 18:58:36 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sfhir\$r4g@tymix.Tymnet.COM>, <rogjdCqpCto.6B6@netcom.com>, <2si4ff\$q06@tymix.Tymnet.COM>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2si4ff\$q06@tymix.Tymnet.COM> flanagan@niagara.Tymnet.COM (Dick Flanagan) writes:

>Those "good old boys" were properly and legitimately coordinated when a lot
>of the sabre-rattling crowd were still in diapers. How long before the next
>Revolution Of The Have Nots throws out =your= "coordinated" repeaters?!? How
>do you protect =your= repeaters from the next batch of frequency grabbers?

Ah, a protector of vested interest. No one is after anyone's repeater equipment. What they are after is use of *public* spectrum being denied them by current squatters under the guise of closed coordinations. Of course people can control use of their privately owned equipment, but they can't do that by claiming exclusive use of a public resource. That would be like someone driving their car on the Interstate and claiming no one else can use that lane for 200 miles because they decided to drive there. They can control who gets in their car and drives it, by appropriate use of locks, but they can't claim ownership of the roadway. As traffic demand increases on the roadway, they may have to give way to high occupancy lanes (open repeaters) where more of the owners of the roadway resource can be accommodated.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 18:41:06 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CqLAIs.HwF@news.hawaii.edu>, <2sfafs\$hg2@btree.brooktree.com>, <2sfrbj\$1r8@mistr-fsw.jpl.nasa.gov>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Ham Radio few problem

In article <2sfrbj\$1r8@mistr-fsw.jpl.nasa.gov> ndp@mistr-fsw.jpl.nasa.gov (Neil D. Pignatano) writes:

>
>Unauthorized use of private property (in this case, closed repeaters)

>may be construed as trespassing or even theft! I hope that you and your
>cronies are prepared to pay the price for your "civil disobedience."
>Just because you operate "legally" within Part 97 and the Communications
>Act of 1934 doesn't mean that you haven't broken any other law. You may
>be in violation of civil/criminal codes regarding trespass and the right
>to posession of property. Think about it...

If a repeater retransmits signals it receives on a public frequency, it's not the responsibility of those legally using that frequency to keep the repeater from doing so. Instead it is the responsibility of the control operator of the repeater to make sure it doesn't re-transmit signals the control operator wishes not to be repeated.

It isn't trespass to drive down a public street and have a private tow truck grab hold of your car and drag it onto private property. In fact it's just the reverse of trespass, it's kidnaping.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 22:14:08 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!dtsdev0!kinzer@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sh2lq\$b77@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>,
<1994Jun1.155833.11624@newsgate.sps.mot.com>, <2sih81\$4rm@agate.berkeley.edu>ews
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2sih81\$4rm@agate.berkeley.edu> kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken A. Nishimura) writes:

>>terms. I would propose that terms be limited to ten years, long enough
>>to obtain an adequate return on the equipment investment, and short
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

> (remainder of dribble removed)

>

>Since when was Amateur Radio a Financial Investment? I think you
[snipped]

>had time to get things working right. Yanking the coordination after 10
>years is stupid -- nobody will want to make a long term investment of
^^^^^

>time and effort and their own money. This is the same kind of short

Speaking of dribbling... I proposed 10 years as long enough, obviously you think longer is needed. You want to tie up the frequency for 50 years or something? I say that is too long to allow for changing public resource needs. Incidentally, I didn't say your investment would be confiscated, just the coordination would be yanked. I find it funny you would chastise me about the investment, then say exactly the same thing. Go buy a clue or something.

-dave

Date: 1 Jun 1994 14:44:29 -0700
From: btree.brooktree.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2si4ff\$q06@tymix.tymnet.com>, <2sid20\$379@btree.brooktree.com>, <YEE.94Jun1132350@mipgsun.mipg.upenn.edu>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <YEE.94Jun1132350@mipgsun.mipg.upenn.edu>, Conway Yee <yee@mipg.upenn.edu> wrote:
>>That's a moot point. 400 as a haven for closed systems was acceptable
>>as late as 1979 when I first ventured up there, but its not acceptable
>>any more! We have to adapt to the greater good.
>
>Wrong! This is about as dangerous an attitude as ANY I have heard on
>USENET. Let me explain with an analogy. "The US as a haven for
>private homes was acceptable as late as 1994 when I last visited the
>US. Its not acceptable any more due to the vast amount of
>homelessness in the world. We have to adapt to the greater good.
>Every homeowner shall be required to house as many homeless as
>possible."
>Closed repeater systems are private property. It can not be
>confiscated "for the common good." TANSTAAFL. If you want an open
>system, put it up yourself.

I agree with you. I don't think we are communicating. I think part of the problem is that the situation in So. Cal is so different than most places in the country. The issue is not property rights to the radios, but "ownership" of the frequency pair. The prevailing attitude is that if you talk on the output of a seldom-used closed repeater or co-channel with an open system, you are jamming and being antisocial. So in effect, an environment exists where seldom-used closed repeaters "own" a freq pair and coordinating groups here support this.

AGAIN: the property right issue is a red herring! It's the attempt at "frequency ownership" that is the big problem in So. Cal.

>The problem, of course, is that there is
>only so much spectrum to spread around. A closed system uses up
>the spectrum and deprives the vast majority of hams access to this
>spectrum. Since this spectrum is meant as a "public park," there is
>something amiss when most of a band is populated by closed repeaters
>that are rarely in use. By analogy, this is like taking Yellowstone
>and partitioning it out to individuals as private fiefdoms. Highly
>active closed repeaters are not the problem as this indicates that the
>spectrum is in use. Closed repeaters that are rarely in use waste
>spectrum. Why can't such repeaters be shunted to a single frequency
>pair with different PL offsets? Open repeaters are open to one and
>all so there should be plenty of users all the time. Closed repeaters
>could share frequency pairs. Thus, the interests of all can be well
>served.

Yes, yes, yes... exactly; now you've got it! I have long been preaching that the ham and citizens bands should be a radio parkland of what ever spectrum is left over after a fair and prudent allocation to government and commercial users. There is a vast amount of spectrum that will be auctioned this summer to PCS. I would like to see a large chunk of that returned to the citizens as a new citizens band for low-cost, licenseless, appliance-radio operation.

This issue of "wanting something for free" is also a red herring. There has never been a shortage of people willing to put open repeaters in So Cal. I have supported several open repeaters and put one on the air. A couple people e-mailed me to say they tried to join "closed" 440 repeater groups and were told "no no-codes allowed", etc. That's just sad!!! If those closed cliques don't want us to share their machine, that's fine, but they have to be willing to share the frequency pair. We all suffer as chunks of our parkland are roped off by these guys.

--

Roger Bly
roger@brooktree.com

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #606
